

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/629,174	07/29/2003	A. Bruce Plumley	G48-1383-1-1	7174
75	08/08/2005		EXAMINER	
Richard R. Michaud McCormick, Paulding & Huber LLP			PRONE, JASON D	
CityPlace II	anding & Hubbi EEI	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
185 Asylum Street Hartford, CT 06103			3724	
			DATE MAILED: 08/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	App	olication No.	Applicant(s)				
		629,174	PLUMLEY, A. BRI	UCE			
Office Action Sumn	nary Exa	miner	Art Unit				
		on Prone	3724				
The MAILING DATE of this of Period for Reply	communication appears	on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence add	aress			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PE THE MAILING DATE OF THIS CO - Extensions of time may be available under the after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of - If the period for reply specified above is less to - If NO period for reply is specified above, the no - Failure to reply within the set or extended perion - Any reply received by the Office later than three earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR	OMMUNICATION. provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). of this communication. nan thirty (30) days, a reply within naximum statutory period will appl od for reply will, by statute, cause months after the mailing date o	In no event, however, may a the statutory minimum of th y and will expire SIX (6) MO the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely NTHS from the mailing date of this co BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	mmunication.			
Status							
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 3)□ Since this application is in c							
Disposition of Claims							
4)	is/are withdrawn fro ed. ected. ed to.	om consideration.					
Application Papers							
9)☐ The specification is objected	to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
2. Certified copies of the3. Copies of the certified	ne of: priority documents hav priority documents hav copies of the priority do nternational Bureau (PC	re been received. re been received in a ocuments have been T Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National s	Stage			
Attachment(s)		_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date			Informal Patent Application (PTO	-152)			

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 3, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerent et al. (2001/0045148) in view of Plumley et al. (2004/0055691). In regards to claim 1, Gerent et al. (2001/0045148) discloses the invention including providing a layer of sheet-type work material (13) carried by a support surface (44), providing a scanning and cutting table (36), the support surface is mounted to the table (44), a carriage mounted to the table for movement back-and-forth in a first coordinate direction in response to commands issued from a controller (52), a cutting head (56) and a scanning head (30) mounted on the carriage (Fig. 1), each for movement independently of the other back-and-forth along the carriage in response to commands issued from the controller in a second coordinate direction approximately perpendicular to said first coordinate direction (56 and 30), and automatically scanning the work material (30). In regards to claim 7, Gerent further discloses the step of providing a cutting head and a scanning head includes providing the cutting head and the scanning head on opposite longitudinal sides of the carriage (Fig. 1).

However, Gerent fails to disclose that the automatically scanning step determines a periphery and detects flaws, automatically nesting a pattern after the flaw

Art Unit: 3724

detection, automatically nesting a pattern piece onto the work material while simultaneously cutting the previously nested pattern piece, and the work material comprises a hide. Plumley et al. (2004/0055691) teaches an automatic scanning step that determines the a periphery and detects flaws (paragraph [0022] lines 11-15), automatically nesting a pattern after the flaw detection (paragraph [0031] lines17-18), nesting a pattern piece onto the work material while simultaneously cutting the previously nested pattern piece (Claim 19), and the work material is a hide (14). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Gerent et al. (2001/0045148) with simultaneously performing the nesting and cutting functions, as taught by Plumley et al. (2004/0055691), to speed up the work that is being performed.

3. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerent et al. (2001/0045148) in view of Plumley et al. (2004/0055691) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gerber (5,089,971). Gerent et al. (2001/0045148) and Plumley et al. (2004/0055691) disclose the invention but fail to disclose that the a vacuum generator for drawing the work material against the support surface, covering the work piece with a layer of impermeable material for being cut with the work piece, and operating the vacuum generator to draw the work material and the layer of impermeable material down against a support surface. Gerber (5,089,971) teaches that a vacuum generator for drawing the work material against the support surface (22 and 42), covering the work piece with a layer of impermeable material for being cut with the work piece (80), and operating the vacuum generator to draw the work material and the

Art Unit: 3724

layer of impermeable material down against a support surface (42). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have provided Gerent et al. (2001/0045148) in view of Plumley et al. (2004/0055691) with a layer of impermeable material and a vacuum generator, as taught by Gerber (5,089,971), to better hold the work piece in place while work is being performed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 17 May 2005 have been fully considered but they are 4. not persuasive. Plumley et al. clearly teaches to Gerent that it is old and well known to simultaneously cut and nest. Therefore, Gerent modified by Plumley et al. clearly discloses nesting a subsequent pattern piece onto the work material wile simultaneously cutting the previously nested pattern piece. Plumley et al. also clearly teaches to Gerent that it is old and well known to automatically scan to determine a periphery and detect flaws as claimed.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 3724

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason Prone whose telephone number is 571-272-4513. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5:00, Mon - (every other) Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 571-272-4514. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JP August 3, 2005 Alian N. Shoap Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3700